each of the independent claims 1, 11, 22, 30, 37, 47, 58, and 68 specify: (1) receiving ***from a requesting device*** a request for providing (i.e., generation of) a user interface session; (2) generating ***for the requesting device*** as part of the user interface session a prompt for the ***user of the requesting device to input a key*** (e.g., an encryption key for sending a message, or a decryption key for retrieval of a message); (3) invoking a resource configured for executing encryption or attempted decryption of the message based on the key ***received from the requesting device*** as part of the user interface session.

Hence, each of the independent claims explicitly specify that the ***unified communications system / server*** invokes the resource configured for executing encryption or attempted decryption of the message. Hence, each of the independent claims enable a user of the requesting device to send and/or receive encrypted messages, *regardless of whether any encryption utility is installed on the requesting device* that is in use by the user. These and other features are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied prior art.

As admitted in the Official Action, Gifford et al. fails to teach a first prompt enabling a user to select encryption, a second prompt for the user to supply an encryption key, or encrypting the message based on the encryption key received from the requesting device.

Yotsukura provides no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever of a ***system or server*** invoking a resource for execution of encryption/attempted decryption of a message ***received from a requesting device***, based on an encryption/decryption key ***received from the requesting device,*** as claimed.

Rather, Yotsukura describes use of object-oriented models for communications between applications programs 101 and 301 within respective computer systems 100 and 300, illustrated in Fig. 17 (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 8-10 and 44-48, col. 9, lines 22-61). Each of the computer systems 100 and 300 also are described as implemented as a stand-alone personal computer, illustrated in Fig. 35 (see, e.g., col. 17, lines 30-60). Hence, one skilled in the art would conclude that the application computer systems 100 and 300 would be implemented as stand-alone personal computers.

Yotsukura also describes use of a "wizard", namely a <u>locally-executable software resource</u>, to prompt an operator to input parameters for a prescribed operation according to a defined class, such as encryption:

> FIGS. 6 to 15 are examples of windows which show processing of the definition unit 33 using a wizard. ***These windows are realized by a graphics user interface (GUI), and a mouse or a keyboard can be used as an input device***, for example.
>
> (Col. 6, lines 55-59).
>
> FIG. 18 is a class diagram of sending unit 103 and receiving unit 303 of FIG. 17. A class library is a set of the template for ***generating an instance***, and the behavior is determined when an instance carries out functional inheritance of the specific class from a class library. ***The software (wizard) by which a user customizes and generates an object is used for this functional inheritance***. Therefore, transmitting processing or reception processing is performed using the class (template) stored in the class library.
>
> (Col. 10, lines 2-11).

Hence, each <u>unit</u> 103 and 303 utilizes a <u>locally-executable software resource</u> that includes in Fig. 18 encryption as an object class within the <u>local class library</u> 104 and 304, respectively.

Hence, Yotsukura teaches that encryption is performed <u>locally</u> by the wizard in the user device 100 <u>*prior* to any transmission</u>:

> FIG. 31 is a sample window of encryption push button to generate an object. ***The wizard prompt*** [sic] to input a key and an object name. The contents such as a body, and attachment inputted into the object name are encrypted according to the key, ***and transmission is carried out***.
>
> (Col. 15, lines 52-56).
>
> FIG. 32B is a confirmation sending dialog according to the first example. This dialog can omit as above-mentioned. The addressee is assigned to the mail address defined in FIG. 32A. And CC is assigned to its mail address for confirmation. Also, The subject is assigned automatically. In the body, an order place and the delivery date specified by FIG. 32A are inserted, and the signature file is incorporated. Furthermore, the articles which place an order are appended and transmitted in the form of an

> attachment file. Here, the form of an attachment file is not restricted to it, although it transmits another format such as CSV.
>
> In transmitting, ***an operator clicks "send with encryption" button if encryption required***. An operator clicks "send" button if no encryption required. On the other hand, an operator clicks "cancel" button if transmission is canceled. The "send" button or "send with encryption" button is clicked, ***the mail is transmitted to the addressee via the Internet with the mail interface***.
>
> (Col. 16, lines 37-54).

Hence, Yotsukura presumes that the same device that performs the encryption is the same device that sends the encrypted message to the destination.

Yotsukura also teaches that decryption is performed locally by the wizard in the destination device 300:

> A decryption class button is a class for performing a decryption about the content of a mail such as a body, attachment. FIG. 31 is a sample window of decryption push button to generate an object. ***The wizard prompt*** [sic] ***to input a key and an object name***. The contents such as a body, and attachment inputted into the object name are decrypted according to the key.
>
> (Col. 15, lines 58-64).
>
> FIG. 33 is a receiving order window according to a first example. First, an operator clicks "receive" button to process receiving order. ***Then, the mail transmitted from the sending system is displayed***. A "decryption" button is clicked when the contents of the ***transmitted mail*** are encrypted.
>
> (Col. 16, lines 55-60).

Hence, Yotsukura teaches that decryption is performed by the locally-executable wizard (see Fig. 33) after the transmitted mail has been received from the sending system.

Hence, Yotsukura provides no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever that encryption/decryption should be performed in anything other than the user device.

Consequently, even if one skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Gifford et al. to include the teachings of Yotsukura, the resulting hypothetical combination still would neither disclose nor suggest the claimed feature that the ***system / server*** performs encryption/decryption based on receiving the key ***from the user device***, as claimed. Rather, the hypothetical combination would require that the user perform the encryption / decryption at his or her user device.

In fact, the prior rejections by the Examiner demonstrate that the prior art consistently teaches that the encryption/decryption should be performed at the user device. (See, e.g., USP 6,584,564 to Olkin and Applicant's Response filed February 25, 2005, pages 24-26). Both Yotsukura and Olkin are consistent in requiring the user device to perform the encryption / decryption. The Examiner is reminded that a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. MPEP §2141.02, page 2100-127 (Rev. 2, May 2004) (citing W.L. Gore & Assoc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984)).

In contrast, the independent claims specify that the ***unified communication system / server*** performs the invoking of the resource for encryption/decryption based on ***receiving the key from the requesting device***. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the applied prior art of a key being transmitted ***between a unified communications system / server*** and a ***user device*** (or requesting device). "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." In re Fritch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In re Mills, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For these and other reasons, the §103 rejection of the independent claims should be withdrawn.

It is believed the remaining dependent claims are allowable in view of their dependency from the respective independent claims.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a) or 1.17(e), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-456, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
Date: January 3, 2006